

loving loyalty and good faith. What he is now, I know not, nor do I care; but at that time the State of Maryland cast its electoral vote for him for the reasons I have named, that we had full confidence in his loyalty and fidelity to the best government on which the sun ever shone.

But we held on and held firmly. The succeeding year we elevated to the gubernatorial chair Thomas H. Hicks; and it was well in the Providence of God that we did put him there; for to-day this scene of carnage that now devastates the State of Virginia, would have swept in fearful surges over Maryland. But Maryland to-day stands firmly anchored within the pale of the Union; and before we get through our work as a Convention, the majority of which represents the loyal people of the State, we have made up our minds that Maryland shall rise above every power that has heretofore kept her down, and take a position that will make her one of the proudest and fairest of the sister States of the Union.

In reference to the article under consideration, let me say that I am in favor of it, first, because a National Government founded upon principles of liberty, capable of maintaining itself at home and abroad, is essential and indispensable to the promotion of the good of any people.

No one, I presume, will deny the proposition that government ordained upon some basis, possessing some elements of strength, capable of supporting itself and compelling obedience to its authority, founded upon true principles, administering and dispensing justice and equity among all the people, recognizing universally conceded principles of law as established by the experience and judgment of mankind and founded upon principles of truth and justice, is indispensable to the happiness and peace of mankind. Men may differ about the basis, forms, and machinery of government, and men do materially differ in that particular, but among all civilized people there is no dispute as to the necessity of forms of government combining the elements of power and strength that will compel obedience to its laws within itself, and be capable of maintaining itself and people against invasion or subjugation from abroad, whilst mankind demonstrate, by the proofs of history, a tendency thus to combine in masses and centralize power under appropriate restrictions. The question of government has furnished a subject of controversy for centuries, as to the best mode of constructing it, how to render it efficient for good, and promotive of the happiness of the human race.

The primitive condition of a people at the time of the formation of a government have much to do with the character of the government they may set up. The age of the world, and the progress of things at the time that marks the era of a people in history, go very far to determine the forms of government they

may desire. Greece and Rome, from their nomadic state, passed through various gradations before they furnished that compact and well settled type of nationality that afterwards marked their career. So has it been with modern Europe. England originally was inhabited by a race that became totally extinct, and the basis of its nationality was constituted of mingled races from various parts of the Continent of Europe. But its territory and its position geographically furnished the outline of national individuality, and although the surges of civil war and the unsettling effects of the devastation produced by the change of masters which swept over the face of England for centuries, it maintained its name and its marked features of nationality down to the present time. Yet its government passed through various gradations, and was changed and altered as the caprice or necessities of the times dictated or demanded. But irrespective of its changes, the forms of government at all times was the government of England.

The people who settled the territory of North America between the Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, and there established a government, differed from any other people in history who have ever formed a government. They were more advanced in the principles of enlightenment—they came to a new country, possessing the advantages afforded the old. They came as intelligent men, equal in capacity to those who constituted the pride and stability of the mother country. They came to enjoy liberty not afforded them in the country of their nativity. They also possessed the peculiarities of people jealous of their liberties, and partaking to a very considerable extent of the prejudices and spirit of persecution against those who differed from them that prevailed in the countries from whence they came. It was also, Mr. President, that a people so remarkable as they were, escaping from the persecutions and oppressions that existed at home, settling down in a vast territory, that each particular community and colony should be jealous of each other, and seek to set up an exclusiveness and a peculiarity of rights that injured to them, specially as such, that caused them to guard those rights with a very jealous care. But, sir, experience and a common interest changed the practice of our people, if it did not change their theories; and if their notions traditionally have descended to their posterity, they have no more existence now than they had then, and are traditions and impracticable ideas still. They differed in their colonial governments, and in the rights and privileges of their governments.

Gentlemen insist upon State sovereignty; insist upon States having never yielded up that right, and impliedly that the States have nationality. How does a State get sovereignty, and what is its capacity to enforce